Species plantarum, Linnæus designated it as *Phaseolus Max.* The description he gave is of itself inadequate. Paclt alluded to the presence in this description of "some specific characters derived from another element, namely *Phaseolus Mungo* L." In the absence of specific details in support of his claim, it is indeed hazardous to accept his contentions and, contrary to his statement, I know of no contemporary botanists who treat the mung bean as conspecific with the soybean. Offsetting this deficiency in his description of 1753, the earlier references cited by Linnæus and the available type specimen of the plant make clear the identity of the soybean. Careful study of them fails to indicate the basonym of *Phaseolus Max* L. to be a *nomen confusum.* The specimen of *Phaseolus Max,* on which Linnæus based his name, was provided him by George Clifford, and is currently reported to be in the Linnæan herbarium. The more ample description by Linnæus in *Hortus Cliffortianus* (1738) is presumed to have been based on the same Clifford specimen, and this earlier account may serve to supplement the inadequate diagnosis in *Species plantarum.*

It is the opinion of Paclt (*loc. cit.*) and, for wholly different reasons, of Hill (*Bot. Mus. Leaflets Harvard Univ.,* 1939, **7**, 107) that the name of the soybean is *Glycine Soja* (L.) Sieb. et Zucc. The name as used contemporarily, and not originally by Siebold and Zuccarini, was based on *Dolichos Soja* L. As was true of *Phaseolus Max,* Linnæus provided only a fragmentary description of *Dolichos Soja* in his *Species plantarum,* but cited his earlier and identical description as given in the *Flora Zeylanica* (1747). This earlier description was based on a specimen collected from cultivation in Ceylon by Paul Herman prior to 1677. After Linnæus' time the wild indigenous prototype or counterpart of the soybean became known to science. Moench (1794) considered it distinct from the cultigen and named it *Soja hispida.* In 1845 Siebold and Zuccarini treated the same plant under the new name of *Glycine Soja.* This is a case involving two different types of specimens collected from two divergent geographic regions: *Dolichos Soja* L. from cultivation and *Glycine Soja* Sieb. et Zucc., an indigen. Other early botanists considered the two plants to be different entities; later botanists have treated them as conspecific. However, by Article 18 of the Rules of Botanical Nomenclature, we are not allowed to take up a name based on a different type from that accepted by the author of the name. Siebold and Zuccarini clearly excluded Linnæus' *Dolichos Soja* from their concept of *Glycine Soja.* It is most unfortunate that they chose the name *Soja* for their plant. Because of these circumstances it is incorrect to cite Linnæus as a parenthetical author of their binomial.

I have attempted to refute Paclt's contention, unsupported by requisite data, that *Glycine Max* (L.) is based on a *nomen confusum* and to show that in no case is the name *Glycine Soja* Sieb. et Zucc. available as a legitimate name for the soybean. It seems clear to me, until such time as the case may be reviewed and an opinion given by more competent authority, that we should continue to designate the soybean as *Glycine Max* (L.) Merrill.

GEORGE H. M. LAWRENCE

Bailey Hortorium, Cornell University

A Six-Segment Head Regenerate in a Supposedly Refractory Earthworm Species, *Lumbricus castaneus* Savigny 1826

It has been shown (Carpenter, E. *Science,* 1948, **108**, 625), that, contrary to general belief, a head of six segments may be regenerated in the manure worm, *Eisenia foetida* (Savigny) 1826. This species, in proper laboratory conditions, regenerates readily and rapidly. *Lumbricus castaneus,* however, has been thought to have little or no regenerative capacity, presumably because of Hescheler's failure to secure regeneration (*Z. Nat.,* Jena, 1896, **30**, 177).

Material was secured from a pile of old leaves behind a Harvard building. Experimental conditions were the same as for *E. foetida* (Gates, G. E. *Biol. Bull.,* 1949, **96**, 129), except that in this case all regeneration was terminated at 30 days. The species has been found only twice in the U. S., and inability to secure further material ended the experiments.

All posterior substrates with transections at levels from 4/5 to 7/8 inclusive survived and regenerated (no operations behind 7/8). Regenerates at 4/5 or 5/6 had little or no metameric differentiation. Regenerates at the next two levels were normally cephalic, of three (1 specimen) and four segments (1) at 6/7, and at 7/8 of six (1) and 5½ (1) segments. In the latter case the half-segment was wedge-shaped and on the left side. The prostomium of each regenerate, apparently completely differentiated, was epilobic, rather than tanylobic as supposedly characteristic of the genus *Lumbricus.*

Regeneration of a normal head of six segments at 7/8 enables prediction of a species capacity to regenerate equimeric heads at 6/7 and all levels anteriorly.

A six-segment-head regenerate from such a limited number of operations, on a supposedly refractory species, seems to warrant another prediction, namely, that further investigation will show that the capacity for head regeneration, throughout the family Lumbricidae, has been underestimated.

G. E. GATES

Colby College, Waterville, Maine

Determination of Condition of Oysters

It is difficult to devise a method of evaluating the condition of an organism by making analyses of only a few of the factors concerned. A recent publication by Robert M. Ingle (*Science,* 1949, **109**, 593) illustrates the nature of this problem in the extensive researches now being made on oysters.

Ingle mentioned that "later workers have adopted the measurement of glycogen content as a supplementary method of evaluation," meaning supplementary to the "index" method, as explained herein, which was developed by the writer and published in brief form in 1938 (in Higgins, E. *Rep. Commis. of Fish,* 1937). The glycogen method is the traditional one and has been employed by various investigators—P. H. Mitchell (*Bull. U. S. Bur. Fisheries,* 1917, **35**, 151), P. S. Galtsoff *et al.* (*Bull. U. S. Bur. Fisheries,* 1935, No. 18), and others.